



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

are given in modern texts not as their author intended them to be delivered, but clipped and trimmed," etc. Hereby he displaces the timid and conventional treatments of the subject by Fleay, Abbott, and less-known writers. The reader must grant him that the proportion of such extended feet, as to which he presents figures, affords at times a fresh kind of evidence for dating the plays, and that the reader and the actor should allow themselves more freedom than heretofore in pronouncing light syllables, however much such abbreviations as "on't," "i'th'," may be endeared by association. As to choosing printed forms, whether an editor should go counter to the wholesome modern tendency, more and more justified by bibliographical science, to stick to the early authorities, is another question. Of the fruitfulness of this minute study of the early editions, and of the influence of one or two eminent English exponents of it, this book is one more example, based though it is like Nebuchadnezzar's image. There is yet more infiltration of clay than I have shown; but there is also more iron, notably the attack (pp. 403 ff.) on Dowden's sentimental view as to Shakespeare's "period of gloom." There is iron enough to keep the book erect. It is a singular mixture of the amateurish and the doctrinaire with diligence, enterprise, and keenness.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY

RECENT WORKS ON PHASES OF THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE

A brief appraisal is given here of a group of works in the field of the Renaissance in England or having a bearing upon it, in order that attention may be called, in the limited space available, to as many as possible of the recent studies that are important for the period.

A survey of the Renaissance and Reformation in Europe as a whole is attempted in the two volumes of Henry Osborn Taylor's *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Macmillan, 1920). Of the five divisions of the work, the first is given to a study of the Renaissance in Italy from Petrarch and Boccaccio to Ariosto, with special chapters for the "publicists" and for the painters. The second records the movements in Germany that culminated in Erasmus and Luther. The third surveys those of France from Louis XI to Calvin with emphasis on a small number of outstanding figures. The fourth deals with England, elaborating—after a passing sketch of the educational thought and activity of the sixteenth century—Wycliffe's career, Lollardism in the fifteenth century, and the progress of the Reformation in its relation to the political problems of the sixteenth century from Tyndale to Hooker. It closes with succinct estimates and eulogies of a small group of men of action and of literary men as inspired voices of the great age. The fifth is concerned with the progress of philosophy and science in the period. The book will prove of real value both to the special student, who will find in it a large body of information in a compact

form, and to the general reader, who will get something of the sweep and complexity of the period and will grasp the significance of the great names without confusing them with those of secondary importance. It is marked by a clear presentation, a skilful digesting of abstract philosophies, and an enthusiasm for most of the great men and many of the phases of the Renaissance.

Unfortunately, however, stimulating as the book is, it fails to give a perspective that the present reviewer regards as essential for an adequate grasp of the meaning of the sixteenth century. The emphasis on the Reformation and its dramatic figures like Luther, Calvin, and Tyndale makes the work a study of the Reformation primarily, while the philosophy and science of the age as expressive of its thought are stressed above literature and the study of humanism. All this may be according to Mr. Taylor's estimate of relative values in the field, but no work proposing to survey all the important aspects of the sixteenth century should neglect the new ideals in education, culture, and literature. In stressing the continuance of the culture and learning of the Middle Ages the author rejects the term Renaissance in his title, and from the same point of view he ignores the significance of the fall of feudalism, of the spread of knowledge among the masses, of the new impulses to individualism, of the passion for fame and the accompanying efforts to acquire all knowledge and culture, and of the new conception of nobility as based on *vertu*, or the social worth and moral force of the individual—aspects that made the age one of real renaissance despite its continuity with the Middle Ages. The educational works of the early Renaissance, the courtesy books later, and finally the treatises on special subjects like criticism and morals—barely touched upon by Mr. Taylor—represent a new contribution to thought even though based on the classics, and a new idealism that inspired much of the creative literature of the age and is constantly reflected in it. Hence the excellent sketches given of Spenser, Shakespeare, and their fellows would be more significant, at least for this work, if they were more closely related to the movements of contemporary thought. Again, a fuller and more sympathetic treatment of the ideals for reforming the church held by men like Colet and Erasmus is needed to round out the treatment of the religious thought of the period. For the vital force of the fanatical religious passion in Luther and his followers that stirs Mr. Taylor was not, for all of its dynamic quality, so significant for English thought and expression in the sixteenth century as was the humanistic reformer's ideal of the human race perfected through knowledge and reason. The Church of England, despite the constant struggle of the Puritans to take the helm, was on the whole guided by the humanists, whose religion, best expressed in the broad liberalism of Hooker, was closely related to the moral idealism of the great literary men of the century. Though the author recognizes what he calls the *via media* in the English religious movement, he fails to show the essential unity that underlay

the educational, cultural, religious, and literary movements in the England of Elizabeth, in spite of the chaotic forms of their expression and the increasing vehemence of the Puritan utterance.

For the background of the Reformation an able and important study is found in Miss Margaret Deanesly's *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions* (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1920). Starting from Sir Thomas More's statement of the liberal attitude of the Catholic church toward the translation and study of the Bible, she reviews the history of Bible translation and study on the Continent from the twelfth century to Luther, and then devotes the major part of her volume to a similar survey for England from the Anglo-Saxon period to Tyndale, dealing with the education of the various classes of the clergy before Wycliffe, with the history of the Lollard movement, especially in relation to the Bible, and with the reading of the Bible among both the Lollards and the orthodox in the fifteenth century. Miss Deanesly has not only made a valuable study of the long preparation for the Reformation, but in her fresh investigation of the general state of culture from Chaucer to Tyndale she has thrown some light on the educational and social condition of England in the period of preparation for the Renaissance.

La Controverse de Martin Marprelate, 1588-1590 (Geneva: A. Jullien, 1916), by G. Bonnard, whether correct or not in all the details of its treatment of a vexed field, is a succinct and clear account, liberally documented, of the origin and progress of the Marprelate controversy. Starting with the theory that Throckmorton was the author of all the Martin tracts (see Appendix A for the argument), M. Bonnard follows the history of their production and of the replies of the anti-Martinists. The book closes with bibliographies of legal documents, of controversial tracts in chronological order, and of modern works bearing on the subject.

Among the works devoted to the poets and poetry of the period, an unusually important one is Frederick Morgan Padelford's edition of *The Poems of Henry Howard Earl of Surrey* recently published as the first of the University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature. The poems, classified according to subject-matter, include Tottel's text of Surrey's translation of the second and fourth books of the *Æneid*, and also the text of the fourth book from Hargrave MS 205. The critical material consists of a full sketch of Surrey's life, an estimate of his contribution to English verse, textual notes, critical notes dealing in detail with sources, bibliography, and glossary. All of this material is skilfully condensed, and the edition bears the marks of careful workmanship. It should long remain standard. Unfortunately there is some evidence in the notes especially of the crude work of a provincial typesetter. How far this affects the trustworthiness of the text I have not been able to determine.

In *Douglas' Æneid* (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1920) Lauchlan M. Watt studies the medieval and Renaissance influences that guided

Douglas his place and influence in the Renaissance, the nature of his translation, the history of his text, etc. The book is valuable for its survey of the early Renaissance in Scotland, one of the most important features of which was Douglas' attempt to make the Latin epic live again in Scottish vernacular poetry. Here he was in advance of the English poets, and he influenced Surrey's similar attempt for England. The subject, however, needs to be handled in a more exhaustive and constructive fashion than Mr. Watt has handled it, in spite of the fact that much of his material is telling and fresh. An adequate account of literary theory and practice in Scotland around 1500, of the extent to which it molded Douglas, and of the extent to which he contributed to the Renaissance in Scotland and England, will make one of the important chapters in the history of the early Renaissance.

Significance of another sort is attached to Hyder E. Rollins' volume of *Old English Ballads, 1553-1625* (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1920) in which are printed seventy-five ballads of the broadside type taken chiefly from manuscripts (especially from Add. MS 15225 and Sloane MS 1896 of the British Museum) and representing the uninspired muse of the religious controversies belonging to the middle of the sixteenth century. On the whole the ballads are inferior to most collections of broadsides that have been published, but their historical importance is considerable because the greater part of them represent uniquely the Catholic point of view. The introduction to the volume and the accounts prefixed to the separate ballads add greatly to the value of the book.

In *English Madrigal Verse 1588-1632* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1920) Edmund H. Fellowes brings together practically all of the verse published in the song books belonging to the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth, when the excellence of music in England stimulated the production of a large body of song, much of it in the best vein of the Elizabethan and Jacobean lyric. Some of the verse in these song books is taken from the works of well-known poets; some of the rest for its excellence has been made accessible in one way or another and so is familiar; but a large body of fine poetry is here put within our reach for the first time. We are fortunate in having the material collected in a single volume so that it may be judged as a whole. Unfortunately Morley's *First Booke of Aires* was inaccessible to Mr. Fellowes (p. xx), and a keener regret will be felt by a large number of students of Elizabethan literature that he chose to omit all of Ravenscroft's volumes except *A Briefe Discourse*, on the ground that they are composed of rounds and folk-songs. The color of folk-song runs through many of the song books, and on that account alone Ravenscroft is needed to complete the collection even if he cannot be put definitely with one of the two classes—madrigalists and lutenists—into which Mr. Fellowes divides the song writers.

Still another phase of the poetry of the period around 1600 receives attention in *The Satire of John Marston* (Columbus, Ohio, 1920), by Morse S. Allen. This work is concerned with the personal satire arising from Marston's literary quarrels and with the satire directed against aspects of contemporary life and manners to be found in the plays as well as in the formal satires. There is basis for disagreement with the author in a number of details, especially on the treacherous ground of the literary quarrels or in his assignment of parts to the separate authors of a joint play or a revised play like *Histrionastix*. But the treatment as a whole, with its conservative handling of the quarrels of Marston and its full analysis of the range of his satire, furnishes a satisfactory sketch of the work of one of the most picturesque figures in a revolutionary decade.

In the field of the drama a notable general study is *English Pageantry, An Historical Outline*, by Robert Withington, in two sumptuous volumes (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918 and 1920). The numerous works devoted to the history of English drama or to types of dramatic literature have given a subordinate place to the pageant as a type, usually treating it as an embryonic form of the masque. This has been due to the fact that pageants are dependent on action and spectacle for their interest while the study of dramatic forms has been undertaken almost invariably from the point of view of literature. Professor Withington treats pageantry as a relatively distinct art with a distinct function in community life, and gives our first adequate history of English pageantry from its dim beginnings in the Middle Ages to the most finished modern efforts in communities of England and America. Following brief surveys, first, of the element of pageant to be found in games and processions of medieval festivals, and, second, of early tournaments, disguisings, and masques as related to pageants, an attempt is made to present fully the history of the "Royal Entry" in England from the end of the thirteenth century to the opening of the nineteenth, and of the most important form of civic pageant—the Lord Mayor's Show of London. These sections on the Royal Entry and the Lord Mayor's Show contain much fresh material and obviously are intended to include all available records, especially for the period down to the end of the seventeenth century. The final section deals with "Survivals and Revivals," "The Parkerian Pageant," which the author considers the important modern movement in the field, and "Pageantry in the United States." An excellent bibliography and an exceptionally full index are provided. I have noted several omissions of important accounts of pageantry in the Renaissance, as for example, the account of the elaborate midsummer pageants of 1521 in London given in the *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1520-6*, pp. 136-37, and that of the pageants presented before Queen Anne in 1613 at Wells, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, XVI, 318-21. But Professor Withington's work is worthy of high commendation for its fresh

contributions to the subject, for its survey of a large field, and for its interpretation of the pageant as a distinct type combining two art forms.

Among new editions of plays is the edition by Franck L. Schoell under the title *Charlemagne* (Princeton University Press, 1920) of the play from Egerton MS 1994 which Bullen edited as *The Distracted Emperor*. The purpose is to give a more correct text than the earlier one and to establish the authorship of Chapman which was suggested by Bullen. The account of Chapman's knowledge of Petrarch, whose *Epistolae* furnished the basis for *Charlemagne*, the excellent analysis of the style of the drama, and the pointing of numerous parallels between it and plays accepted in the Chapman canon make the ascription seem more than plausible. There is still a possibility, however, that the crudeness of the play, which is partly responsible for Professor Schoell's assigning the date 1598-99, is due to its having been written by an imitator of Chapman. In view of this it seems strange that verse tests were considered of so little value in comparison with tests of style and parallel passages that they are simply referred to as supporting the argument for Chapman's authorship and for the date assigned (p. 15). The matter should have been elaborated, for every possible bit of evidence is needed to establish the authorship of a play in a period like the Elizabethan when there was a free use of plots and incidents and a constant borrowing of aphorisms and striking poetic passages.

Two worthy examples of the modern college dissertation are the edition of Jonson's *Catiline His Conspiracy* in the Yale Studies in English (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916), by Lynn H. Harris, from the text of the 1616 Folio of Jonson's works, and that of Massinger and Field's *Fatal Dowry* (Lancaster, Pa., 1918), a Princeton dissertation, by Charles L. Lockert, Jr., from the text of the early quarto, 1632. In the careful reproduction of the original texts with variant readings, in the study of such aspects of the history of the plays as date and source—and in the case of the *Fatal Dowry* the distribution of parts to joint authors—and in annotation, especially in indicating Jonson's constant classical borrowing, the editors have apparently done their tasks well. Both volumes will be welcomed as books of reference for the student of the Elizabethan drama.

Books on Shakespeare continue to multiply. An edition of his works is well advanced in "The Yale Shakespeare" published by the Yale University Press in a series of neat volumes, each given to a single play or other work edited by a member of the English faculty of Yale. The edition is a very practical one for students or libraries. The text with glossarial notes at the bottom of the pages comes first. Brief explanatory notes follow. The material dealing with sources of the plays, history of the text, etc., is usually given in appendixes at the end, which present in succinct form the established facts or generally accepted theories. In some cases, like Tucker

Brooke's edition of *I Henry VI* or S. T. Williams' edition of *Timon*, problems of source, authorship, etc., are treated somewhat more fully. A brief bibliography and an index conclude each volume.

Students of Shakespeare generally will welcome the reissue of so important a volume on the history of Shakespeare's text as Mr. Alfred W. Pollard's *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of His Text* (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1920), which is now out of print in its first form. Mr. Pollard argues that "the Quartos regularly entered on the Registers of the Stationers' Company were neither stolen nor surreptitious," and has brought together "some little evidence that some at least of these editions may have been set up from Shakespeare's autograph manuscript" (p. 104). An introduction added in the new edition reviews the critical literature of the last ten or twelve years—much of it from Mr. Pollard's own pen—which has contributed new facts or new approaches to the study of the problems of Shakespeare's text. The book inaugurates a projected series by Mr. Pollard and Mr. J. Dover Wilson entitled "Shakespeare Problems."

Ludwig Tieck's *Buch über Shakespeare* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1920), the first of Neudrucke Deutscher Literaturwerke des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts, is edited by H. Lüdeke from manuscripts, with an introduction telling the story of Tieck's unrealized plans for a work of broad scope on Shakespeare. The various manuscripts, given here more fully than before, comprise notes made on Shakespeare's plays at the end of the eighteenth century—these cover 364 printed pages—several short collections of miscellaneous notes, including translations of scenes from English plays, Tieck's account of the plan for his book, and the two experimental chapters of an introduction written about 1815. The interest of the work is now almost altogether historical, and its chief value lies in the light it throws on Tieck rather than on Shakespeare.

In *The Position of the "Roode en Witte Roos" in the Saga of King Richard III* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Madison, 1919), Oscar J. Campbell prints from the Amsterdam edition of 1651 the Dutch play of Lambert van den Bos studied here, together with an English translation running at the bottom of the pages. In his introduction the editor presents detailed evidence to show that van den Bos, who translated a number of English works into Dutch, did not base his play on the chronicles or on Shakespeare, but had apparently some dramatic source as a result of which the play "shows resemblances to each of the extant Richard III plays—*Richardus Tertius*, *The True Tragedie of Richard the third*, and Shakespeare's *Richard III*—in respects in which they differ from each other and from the Chronicle sources" (p. 19). Further he argues that Shakespeare must "have known and used [the lost play], now and then,

to point material which he derived largely from Holinshed" (p. 57). While the evidence is not overwhelming, it is sufficient to make quite plausible the theory that the Dutch version reflects a lost play used by Shakespeare.

Elmer Edgar Stoll's *Hamlet: An Historical and Comparative Study* (Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Studies in Language and Literature, September, 1919) interprets the character of Hamlet in the light of tradition and of Elizabethan conventions as that of a man of resolution and reserve, well-poised, and bent on action. The study reflects a mind stored with knowledge of Shakespeare and Elizabethan literature generally, and hence is instructive and stimulating throughout. But the interpretation seems to me incorrect and the line of argument fallacious, despite the truth of much of the detail. For Professor Stoll, as I see it, would deny meaning to many a passage of *Hamlet* like "lapsed in time and passion" (III, iv, 107) and the speeches on suicide (I, ii, 129 ff., and III, i, 56 ff.), and for the text of Shakespeare as a basis of interpretation would substitute guesses as to what might be the correct stage-action by which the true Elizabethan conception of Hamlet could be determined. Every interpretation of the character, however, is a challenge to students of the problem, and we must give the author credit for a stout championship of the sturdy Hamlet of his conception.

In *The First Quarto of Shakespeare's Hamlet* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Madison, 1920) Frank G. Hubbard attempts to establish the fact that the First Quarto of *Hamlet* is not a pirated and garbled text but a complete copy of a consistent and effective version of the play (p. 32), which has been regarded too much in the light of the Second Quarto. His introduction sets forth this theory, based principally on the argument that the errors of the text are not of an extent and type unusual in Elizabethan printing. A modernized text of Q₁ is given with the errors corrected and the lines rearranged to indicate the true metrical lines, the present readings and arrangements of Q₁ being indicated in the footnotes. In presenting the case for the First Quarto in its best light, Professor Hubbard has made a valuable contribution toward the solution of one of the problems of Hamlet, but he can hardly be regarded as having solved it.

C. R. BASKERVILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO